



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/774,236	01/29/2001	Daniel Isaac Goodman	43426.00046	9845

7590

05/23/2006

EITAN LAW GROUP  
7 Shenkar Street  
POB 2081  
Herzlia, 46120  
ISRAEL

EXAMINER
----------

KHOSHNOODI, NADIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2137

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/774,236	GOODMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nadia Khoshnoodi	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-175 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14-18, 22-37, 39-43, 47-58, 60-63, 67-79, 81-84, 88-92, 115-132, 141-153, 157-167, and 171-175 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims withdrawn from consideration are 13,19-21,38,44-46,59,64-66,80,85-87,93-114,133-140,154-156 and 168-170.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/21/2005 has been entered.

***Response to Amendment***

Claims 13, 19-21, 38, 44-46, 59, 64-66, 80, 85-87, 93-114, 133-140, 154-156, and 168-170 have been cancelled. Applicant's arguments/amendments with respect to amended claims 1, 26, 51, 72, 115, 124, 141-143, 157, & 171-175 and previously presented claims 2-12, 14-18, 22-25, 27-33, 34-37, 39-43, 47-50, 52-58, 60-63, 67-69, 70-71, 73-79, 81-84, 88-92, 116-117, 118, 119-123, 125, 126, 127-132, 144-153, & 158-167 filed March 16, 2006 have been fully considered and therefore the claims are rejected under new grounds.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 17-18, 25, 42-43, 50, 62-63, 70, 83-84, 91, 119-120, 123, 128-129, & 132 contain the trademark/trade names "Macintosh DrawText" and "Microsoft Windows GetTextExtent."

Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a

particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe a specific operating system function and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite. For purposes of examination, the trademarked portion of the claim limitation will not be considered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

I. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

II. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 12, 14-18, 24-28, 30-33, 37, 39-43, 49-53, 55-58, 60-63, 69-74, 76-79, 81-84, 90-92, and 171-172 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard et al. United States Patent Application Publication 2001/0042045 and further in view of Ram et al., United States Patent Application Publication 2002/0194485.

As per claims 1, 26, and 171:

Howard et al. substantially teach a method/system/computer readable medium with stored program code for protecting content within a page displayed by a computer, comprising

identifying a designated portion of original content contained within a page to be protected (paragraph 44, lines 3-5), modifying the page comprising encrypting the designated portion of original content to form a portion of encrypted content (paragraph 46, lines 6-10), replacing the designated portion of original content within the page with the portion of encrypted content is (inherent, however this concept is suggested by paragraph 61, lines 8-11), rendering<sup>1</sup> the page into a graphics device comprising decrypting the portion of encrypted content (paragraph 51, lines 1-4), displaying at least a portion of data from the graphics device (paragraph 50, lines 1-6 corresponding to applicants' definition of items specified to be a graphics device on page 12, paragraph 49, lines 5-6) and converting content into a graphics output (paragraph 51, lines 1-4 and paragraph 68). Also disclosed by Howard et al. is wherein the content is text (paragraph 21).

Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system/computer readable medium with stored program code wherein rendering the page into a graphics device comprises intervening with at least one function that controls page display layouts comprising determining a display layout for the page based on the spatial characteristics of decrypted text instead of spatial characteristics of encrypted text, to ensure that the display layout for the page corresponds to that of a page containing the designated portion of original text. However, Ram et al. teach a rendering application which carries out a formatting process and then sends the polarized data to be de-polarized and then restored the original form of the document as the presentation data, thus the layout is determined based on the spatial characteristics of the decrypted, i.e. original text. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the word "render" was not specifically used, the definition according to [www.netlingo.com](http://www.netlingo.com) shows that the function of rendering does take place. Below is the definition of render used.

Art Unit: 2137

to modify the method disclosed in Howard et al. for the rendering function to intervene with at least one function that controls page display layouts and allow for the layout to be determined based on spatial characteristics of the decrypted text, i.e. the original text, in order to maintain the properties and layout of the original page. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since Ram et al. suggest that rendering is an important step for the data to be protected in due to the fact that the data is vulnerable to unauthorized copying if rendered improperly in paragraphs 15 and 49.

As per claims 2, 27, 52, and 73:

Howard et al. and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1, 26, 51, and 72. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the page is a web page (paragraph 38, lines 12-19).

As per claims 3, 28, 53, and 74:

Howard et al. and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 2, 27, 52, and 73. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the web page is an HTML page (paragraph 37, lines 1-25 and paragraph 39, lines 1-3).

As per claims 5, 30, 55, and 76:

Howard et al. and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1, 26, 51, and 72. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the page is part of a document produced by a software application (paragraph 34).

As per claims 6, 31, 56, and 77:

Howard et al. and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1, 26, 51, and 72. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the graphics device is a memory device (paragraph 50, lines 1-6).

As per claims 7, 32, 57, and 78:

Howard et al. and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1, 26, 51, and 72. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the graphics device is a screen device (paragraph 40, lines 23-25 and paragraph 88, lines 5-11).

As per claims 8, 33, 58, and 79:

Howard et al. and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1, 26, 51, and 72. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the graphics device is a graphics port<sup>2</sup> (paragraph 39 and paragraph 40, lines 23-34). Although there is no explicit reference made to a graphics port, the elements referred to in the detailed description use ports to transfer graphics, thus it is identical to there being a graphics port.

As per claims 12 and 37:

Howard et al. and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1 and 26. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method wherein the content and said encrypting comprises padding encrypted text so that identical words have distinct encrypted representations

---

<sup>2</sup> The definition of port as pasted from [www.netlingo.com](http://www.netlingo.com) is as follows:

**Port** - Commonly known as the place where information goes into and out of a computer, or both. For example, the serial port on a personal computer is where a modem or printer is connected.

On the Internet, "port" often refers to a number that is shown in a URL, following a colon right after the domain name. Every service on an Internet server "listens" on a particular port number. Most of these services have standard port numbers. Web servers normally listen on port 80, and the standard Gopher port is 70. (Services can also listen on nonstandard ports, in which case the port number must be specified in a URL when the server is accessed.)



Art Unit: 2137

(paragraph 46, lines 6-10). Although the term padding is not used, the definition of padding<sup>3</sup> suggests that it is inherent.

As per claims 14, 39, 60, and 81:

Howard et al. and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1, 26, 51, and 72. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the graphics output is a raster output (paragraph 40, lines 23-34). Although the term "raster output" is not explicitly used, a CRT<sup>4</sup> is used as the display device, hence it is identical to that of a "raster output."

As per claims 15 and 40:

Howard et al. and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1 and 26. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein said identifying, said encrypting, and said replacing are performed by a server computer, and wherein said controlling,

---

<sup>3</sup> According to the Hacking Lexicon dictionary online, the definition of padding is as follows:

**Padding** - Padding is the process of adding unused data to the end of a message in order to make it conform to a certain length. For example, block-ciphers often work on blocks that are 64-bits (8-bytes) long. Therefore, if you have a message that is 77-bytes long, you will need to "pad" it with an extra 3-bytes to make it an even 80-bytes in size (10-blocks).

**Key point:** Padding is a regular feature of all crypto algorithms, including hashing and encryption. Some algorithms have been broken due to poor choices for padding. Most importantly, however, the size of the message can often reveal details about its contents. For example, let's assume a protocol whereby somebody accepts something with a simple message of "yes", but when it declines, it says "no" along with a reason why it was rejected. Therefore, even though the messages are encrypted, the "yes" will be a short message but the "no" will be a long message.

<sup>4</sup> The definition of Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) from the Free Online Dictionary of Computing is as pasted below:

**CRT** - An electrical device for displaying images by exciting phosphor dots with a scanned electron beam. CRTs are found in computer VDUs and monitors, televisions and oscilloscopes. The first commercially practical CRT was perfected on 29 January 1901 by Allen B DuMont.

A large glass envelope containing a negative electrode (the cathode) emits electrons (formerly called "cathode rays") when heated, as in a vacuum tube. The electrons are accelerated across a large voltage gradient toward the flat surface of the tube (the screen) which is covered with phosphor. When an electron strikes the phosphor, light is emitted. The electron beam is deflected by electromagnetic coils around the outside of the tube so that it scans across the screen, usually in horizontal stripes. This scan pattern is known as a raster. By controlling the current in the beam, the brightness at any particular point (roughly a "pixel") can be varied.

Art Unit: 2137

said rendering, and said displaying are performed by a client computer connected to the server computer over a network (paragraph 88, lines 5-11).

As per claims 16, 41, 61, and 82:

Howard et al. and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1, 26, 51, and 72. Furthermore, Ram et al. teach the method/system occurring within a patched operating system function for outputting content (par. 49).

As per claims 17, 42, 62, and 83:

Howard et al. and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 16, 41, 61, and 82 above. Also disclosed by Howard et al. is the method wherein the content is text content (paragraph 33, lines 1-5). Furthermore, Ram et al. teach the method/system wherein the operating system function is a function (par. 49).

As per claims 18, 43, 63, and 84:

Howard et al. and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 16, 41, 61, and 82 above. Also disclosed by Howard et al. is the method wherein the content is text content (paragraph 33, lines 1-5). Furthermore, Ram et al. teach the method/system wherein the operating system function is a function (par. 49).

As per claims 24, 49, 69, and 90:

Howard et al. and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 23, 48, 68, and 89. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system of decrypting encrypted text strings on the client's computer (paragraph 46, lines 6-10). Furthermore, Ram et al. teach the method/system occurring within a patched operating system function for determining widths of character strings (par. 68).

As per claims 25, 50, 70, and 91:

Howard et al. and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 24, 49, 69, and 90. Furthermore, Ram et al. teach the method/system wherein the operating system function is a function (par. 49).

As per claims 51, 72, and 172:

Howard et al. teach a method/system/computer readable medium with stored program code for protecting content within a page displayed by a computer, comprising accessing a page containing a portion of encrypted content (paragraph 39, lines 1-3), rendering<sup>5</sup> the page into a graphics device comprising decrypting the portion of encrypted content (paragraph 51, lines 1-4), and displaying at least a portion of data from the graphics device (paragraph 50, lines 1-6 corresponding to applicants' definition of items specified to be a graphics device on page 12, paragraph 49, lines 5-6) and converting content into a graphics output (paragraph 51, lines 1-4 and paragraph 68). Also disclosed by Howard et al. is wherein the content is text (paragraph 21).

Not explicitly disclosed is the method/system/computer readable medium with stored program code wherein rendering the page into a graphics device comprises controlling a display layout for the modified page comprising determining a layout based on spatial characteristics of decrypted text instead of spatial characteristics of the encrypted text, to ensure that the display layout corresponds to a page containing the designated portion of original text. However, Ram et al. teach a rendering application which carries out a formatting process and then sends the polarized data to be de-polarized and then restored the original form of the document as the presentation data, thus the layout is determined based on the spatial characteristics of the

---

<sup>5</sup> See footnote (1) on page 4

decrypted, i.e. original text. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Howard et al. for the rendering function to intervene with at least one function that controls page display layouts and allow for the layout to be determined based on spatial characteristics of the decrypted text, i.e. the original text, in order to maintain the properties and layout of the original page. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since Ram et al. suggest that rendering is an important step for the data to be protected in due to the fact that the data is vulnerable to unauthorized copying if rendered improperly in paragraphs 15 and 49.

As per claim 71:

Howard et al. and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 51. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method further comprising receiving the page having a portion of encrypted content from a server computer (paragraph 88, lines 5-11).

As per claim 92:

Howard et al. and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 72. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach a system further comprising a network connector and a receiver receiving the page having a portion of encrypted content from a server computer via said network connector (paragraph 39).

III. Claims 4, 29, 54, and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard et al. United States Patent Application Publication 2001/0042045 as applied to claims 2, 27, 52, 73, 94, and 105 above, and further in view of the definition of XML, found at [netlingo.com](http://netlingo.com).

As per claims 4, 29, 54, and 75:

Howard et al. and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 2, 27, 52, and 73. Not explicitly disclosed is the method/system wherein the web page is an XML page. However, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the web page is an HTML page. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Howard et al. to incorporate the web page as an XML page. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by the definition of XML as found on [www.netlingo.com](http://www.netlingo.com) and pasted below:

A programming language/specification developed by the W3C. XML is a pared-down version of SGML, designed especially for Web documents. It enables Web authors and Web developers to create their own customized tags to provide functionality not available with HTML. For example, XML supports links that point to multiple documents (as opposed to HTML links, which can reference just one destination each). XML provides a powerful set of tools for developing a new generation of Web applications, including tools like database exchange, distribution of processing to clients, multiple views of data, intelligent agents, management of document collections, and so on.

IV. Claims 9-11, 22-23, 34-36, 47-48, 67-68, and 88-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard et al. United States Patent Application Publication 2001/0042045 and further in view of Ram et al., United States Patent Application Publication 2002/0194485 Bloomberg United States Patent No. 5,761,686.

As per claim 9 and 34:

Howard et al. and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1 and 26. Not explicitly disclosed is the method/system wherein said encrypting is based on encoding of characters. However, Bloomberg teaches the method/system wherein said encrypting is based on encoding of characters. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a

Art Unit: 2137

person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. to carry out the encryption based on an encoding of characters. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg in col. 8, lines 4-8.

As per claim 10 and 35:

Howard et al. and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1 and 26. Not explicitly disclosed is the method/system wherein said encrypting is based on encoding of words. However, Bloomberg teaches the method/system wherein said encrypting is based on encoding of words. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. to carry out the encryption based on an encoding of words. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg in col. 12, lines 22-29.

As per claim 11 and 36:

Howard et al. and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1 and 26. Not explicitly disclosed is the method/system wherein said encrypting comprises adding leading and trailing characters to flag encrypted text. However, Bloomberg teaches the method/system wherein said encrypting comprises adding leading and trailing characters to flag encrypted text. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. to carry out the encryption and adding leading and trailing characters to flag encrypted text. This modification

Art Unit: 2137

would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg in col. 13, lines 22-26.

As per claim 22, 47, 67, and 88:

Howard et al. and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1, 26, 51, and 72. Not explicitly disclosed is the method/system, wherein said determining comprises calculating widths of character strings. However, Bloomberg teaches the method/system wherein said formatting comprises calculating widths of character strings. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. to incorporate formatting comprising of calculating widths of character strings. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg in col. 12, lines 22-29 and col. 14, lines 19-23.

As per claim 23, 48, 68, and 89:

Howard et al. and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 22, 47, 67, and 88. Not explicitly disclosed is the method/system, wherein said determining comprises decrypting encrypted text strings. However, Bloomberg teaches the method/system wherein said formatting comprises decrypting encrypted text strings. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. to incorporate formatting comprising decrypting encrypted text strings. This modification would have been obvious because a person having

ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg as depicted in figures 4 and 5.

V. Claims 115-132, 141-142, and 174 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lesk, United States Patent No. 5,905,505, and further in view of Ram et al., US Pub. No. 2002/0194485.

As per claims 115, 124, and 173:

Lesk substantially teaches a method/system/computer readable medium with stored program code for protecting text within a page displayed by a computer comprising rendering the page according to the page layout into a graphics device comprising replacing the first portion of text with a second portion of text (col. 7, lines 42-47), converting second portion of text to a graphics output (col. 7, lines 48-53), and writing the graphics output into the graphics device (col. 7, lines 48-53).

Not explicitly disclosed is the method/system/computer readable medium with stored program code formatting a page containing a first portion of text to determine a page layout for display comprising intervening with at least one function that controls page display layouts, to base the page layout on spatial characteristics of a second portion of text instead of spatial characteristics of a first portion of text, to ensure that the display layout corresponds to that of a page containing the designated portion of the second portion of text. However, Ram et al. teach a rendering application which carries out a formatting process and then sends the polarized data to be de-polarized and then restored the original form of the document as the presentation data, thus the layout is determined based on the spatial characteristics of the decrypted, i.e. original text. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was



Art Unit: 2137

made to modify the method disclosed in Howard et al. for the rendering function to intervene with at least one function that controls page display layouts and allow for the layout to be determined based on spatial characteristics of the decrypted text, i.e. the original text, in order to maintain the properties and layout of the original page. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since Ram et al. suggest that rendering is an important step for the data to be protected in due to the fact that the data is vulnerable to unauthorized copying if rendered improperly in paragraphs 15 and 49.

As per claims 116 and 125:

Lesk and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 115 and 124. Furthermore, Lesk teaches wherein the first portion of text has the same word width as does the second portion of text (fig. 6 and fig. 7 depicted by the second word in each figure as one example).

As per claims 117 and 126:

Lesk and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 115 and 124. Furthermore, Lesk teaches the method/system wherein the graphics output is a raster output (col. 5, 1-14).

As per claims 118 and 127:

Lesk and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system of replacing the first portion of text with the second portion of text. Furthermore, Ram et al. teach the method occurring within a patched operating system function for converting text into the graphics output (par. 49).

As per claims 119 and 128:

Lesk and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system wherein said replacing the first portion of text with a second portion of text occurs within a patched operating system function for converting text into the graphics output, as applied to claims 118 and 127 above. Furthermore, Ram et al. teach the method/system wherein the operating system function is function (par. 49).

As per claims 120 and 129:

Lesk and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system wherein said replacing the first portion of text with a second portion of text occurs within a patched operating system function for converting text into the graphics output, as applied to claims 118 and 127 above. Furthermore, Ram et al. teach the method/system wherein the operating system function is a function (par. 49).

As per claims 121 and 130:

Lesk and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 115 and 124. Furthermore, Ram et al. teach the method wherein said formatting comprises replacing first text strings with the second text strings (par. 49) and calculating widths of the second text portion based on selected font types and font sizes (par. 68).

As per claims 122 and 131:

Lesk and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system wherein said formatting comprises replacing first text strings with second text strings and calculating widths of the second text strings based on selected font types and font sizes as applied to claims 121 and 130

above. Furthermore, Ram et al. teach the method/system occurring within a patched operating system function for determining widths of character strings (par.65).

As per claims 123 and 132:

Lesk and Ram et al. substantially teach the method/system wherein replacing first text strings with second text strings occurs within a patched operating system function for determining widths of characters as applied to claims 122 and 131 above. Furthermore, Ram et al. teach the method/system wherein the operating system function is a function (par. 49).

As per claims 141-142 and 174:

Lesk substantially teaches a method for protecting text within a page displayed by a computer comprising replacing first text strings with second text strings (col. 7, lines 42-47) and replacing a first portion of text with a second portion of text when rendering the page according to the page layout into a graphics device (col. 7, lines 48-53). Not explicitly disclosed is replacing first text strings with second text strings when formatting a page to determine a page layout. However, Ram et al. teach that each of the digital documents are formatted to determine the original page layout in a pre-processing and pre-rendering stage in order to properly display it when the user is validated to view it. Furthermore, in a different embodiment Ram et al. also teach that the decryption step may be a part of the rendering step. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Lesk to replace the text strings with one another when determining the page layout and formatting the page. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since Ram et al. suggest that pre-rendering is essential in order to ensure compatibility between

the sender's and receiver's devices so that the rendering engine can read the correct format in paragraphs 49 and 68.

VI. Claims 143-153, 157-167, and 175 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lesk, United States Patent No. 5,905,505 and further in view of Howard et al. United States Patent Application Publication 2001/0042045.

As per claims 143, 157, and 175:

Lesk substantially teaches a method/system/ computer readable medium with stored program code for displaying a page containing text while protecting the text from being copied, comprising rendering a source file for a page containing text into graphics output, wherein (i) when displayed on a screen, the page containing text appears with a first portion of text (col. 7, lines 48-53) and (iii) the source file opened by the Internet web browser to render the page contains a third portion of text in place of the first portion of text, the third portion being different than the first portion of text (col. 7, lines 42-47).

Not explicitly disclosed by Lesk et al. is the method/system/ computer readable medium with stored program code wherein (ii) an electronic capture of the screen data produces an image containing a second portion instead of the first portion of text, the second portion being different than the first portion of text. However, Howard et al. teach an attempt to capture the screen data will produce a second portion of text, where the second portion is a blank and flushed out portion of text. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system/computer readable medium with stored program code disclosed in Lesk to have the electronic capture of the screen data to produce an image containing a second portion instead of the first portion of text, where the second portion is

Art Unit: 2137

different from the first. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since Howard et al. suggest that allowing the client should not be blocked from viewing the data but should be blocked from making unauthorized copies such as screen captures in par. 63-66 and par. 96-97.

As per claims 144 and 158:

Lesk and Howard et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 143 and 157. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the source file is a text document file (par. 10-11 and par. 34-37).

As per claims 145 and 159:

Lesk and Howard et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 143 and 157. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the source file is an HTML file (par. 10-11).

As per claims 146 and 160:

Lesk and Howard et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 143 and 157. Not explicitly disclosed is the method/system wherein the second portion of text is an encryption of the first portion of text. However, Lesk teaches that the third portion of text can be an encryption of a first portion of text. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Lesk to have the second portion also be an encryption of the first portion of text. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Lesk in col. 7, lines 42-47.

As per claims 147 and 161:

Lesk and Howard et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 143 and 157. Furthermore, Lesk teaches that the third portion of text can be an encryption of a first portion of text (col. 7, lines 42-47).

As per claims 148 and 162:

Lesk and Howard et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 143 and 157. Not explicitly disclosed is the method/system wherein the second portion of text is identical to the third portion of text. However, Lesk teaches that the third portion of text can be an encryption of the first portion of text thereby making it obvious that the second portion of text can be an encryption of the first portion of text as well. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Lesk to use the same encryption algorithm when encrypting the first portion of text. It then follows that the second and third portions of text would be identical because they were both encrypted using the same algorithm in combination with the first portion of text. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Lesk in col. 7, lines 42-47.

As per claims 149 and 163:

Lesk and Howard et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 143 and 157. Furthermore, Lesk teaches the method/system wherein the second portion of text is different than the third portion of text (col. 7, lines 42-47).

As per claims 150 and 164:

Lesk and Howard et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 143 and 157. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the electronic capture of the screen data is performed by a PrintScreen command (par. 8-9).

As per claims 151 and 165:

Lesk and Howard et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 143 and 157. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the electronic capture of the screen data is performed by a Copy command and a Paste command (par. 4-5).

As per claims 152 and 166:

Lesk and Howard et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 143 and 157. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the electronic capture of the screen data is written to a computer memory (par. 14-15).

As per claims 153 and 167:

Lesk and Howard et al. substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 143 and 157. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the electronic capture of the screen data is written to a clipboard (par. 4-5 and par. 33).

*\*References Cited, Not Used:*

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- (1) US Patent No. 6,282,653
- (2) US Patent No. 6,052,780
- (3) US Patent No. 5,822,432
- (4) US Pub. No. 2002/0188570
- (5) US Pub No. 2002/0021807

The previously cited references are relevant due to the manner in which the invention is claimed.

*Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nadia Khoshnoodi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3825. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Nadia Khoshnoodi  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2137  
5/15/2006

NK



EMMANUEL L. MOISE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER